

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 8, 2007, the Examiner rejected all pending claims 1-25 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0037750 (Hussain). To anticipate a claim, each and every element set forth in the claim must be found in a single reference. (MPEP § 2131). Applicants submit that Hussain does not teach each element of any of independent claims 1, 22 or 29.

The present application is directed to a method and system for conveying location-granularity preferences with location-based service requests. Location of a mobile station (and client stations in general) is a sensitive piece of information, and releasing it to random entities might pose security and privacy risks. The ability for a user to find others at any time is a powerful utility, but the ability for others to find the user at any time may be an uncomfortable notion for the user. People may not want to be stalked by strangers, suffocated by friends and family, or always locatable by business associates, for example. Further, at times people may not want to be located, or may want to restrict the accuracy at which they can be located. Thus, in an exemplary embodiment, a mechanism of providing location privacy options for a user is presented. The mechanism may take the form of a method including, within a client station, detecting a request to initiate a voice call, and responsive to the request, sending from the client station into a network a message indicating how to carry out a location-based service. In particular, the message may direct the network to determine (or not determine) a location of the client station. In addition, the message may indicate a location determination consent level of a user of the client station. (Specification, p. 2-6).

Applicants submit that Hussain does not teach “in a client station, detecting a request to initiate a voice call,” and “responsive to the request, sending from the client station into a

network a message indicating how to carry out a location-based service,” as in claim 1 and similarly in claims 22 and 29.

Within paragraphs 0134-0142, Hussain teaches a signal exchange for providing location information of mobile equipment (ME) to a Police System Emergency Terminal (PSET). Hussain teaches that in a conventional system, when an MS initiates an emergency call, the network forwards the call to a PSET, which contacts an MPC with a location inquiry to determine the geographic origin of the emergency call. The MPC must then establish a connection to the MS through an MSC/VLR. The invention within Hussain eliminates some of the conventional signaling. Hussain teaches that when the ME detects that a preselected number has been dialed, the ME initiates a dual communication to the MSC/VLR.

The dual communication includes a voice and a data portion. The voice portion is forwarded from the MSC/VLR to the PSET, while the data portion is forwarded to a service control server (SCS). The data call portion includes location information for the ME and may optionally include a request to the SCS to begin or continue acquisition of a more-accurate location (e.g., via an MPC). When the SCS receives the location information from the ME in the data call portion, the SCS can provide the location information to an inquiring node/entity. After the PSET receives the voice call portion, the PSET “realizes” the need for location information on the originating ME and instead of setting up a signaling chain as in a conventional system, the PSET may send a location inquiry to the SCS.

Hussain does not teach “in a client station, detecting a request to initiate a voice call,” and “responsive to the request, sending from the client station into a network a message indicating how to carry out a location-based service,” as in claim 1 and similarly in claims 22 and 29. Within Hussain, the message sent from the originating ME does not indicate how to carry out a location-based service. In contrast, the data call portion of the dual communication includes

location information from the ME or a request to determine the location of the ME. (para. 0139, lines 7-11). The data call portion does not include instructions for how to carry out a location-based service.

Hussain is not directed to a method and system for conveying location-granularity preferences with location-based service requests. Hussain makes no mention of location-granularity preferences sent by a client station. Hussain teaches that once the SCS receives the location information from the ME, the SCS can prepare for a communication exchange with the PSET (if the call is an emergency call) by forwarding the known location of the ME automatically or contacting an MPC to ascertain a more-accurate location of the ME prior to the communication exchange. (para 0142). Within Hussain, the ME does not include location-granularity preferences, and certainly does not send a message indicating a location granularity preference of the user before initiating a voice call (e.g., claim 22).

For every pending claim (except dependent claim 30), the Examiner cited to paragraphs 0135-0141 as allegedly teaching the limitations. None of those paragraphs touch upon much of the subject matter contained in the claims. As a few examples, none of those paragraphs discuss a message directing the network not to determine a location of the client station (as in claim 10), a message indicating a location determination consent level of a user of the client station (as in claim 11), or a message indicating a location granularity preference that instructs the network to determine a location of the client station, and based on the location, to provide a randomly adjusted location of the client station to a location-based application that corresponds to the voice call (as in claims 12-13).

In sum, because Hussain does not teach all limitations of any of independent claims 1, 22 or 29, Hussain does not anticipate claims 1-25 and 29-30.

***Conclusion***

Applicants respectively submit that, in view of the remarks above, all of rejections have been overcome. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the present rejections be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3331 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP**

Date: May 8, 2007

By: /Joseph A. Herndon/  
Joseph A. Herndon  
Reg. No. 50,469